



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,398	02/09/2004	Andrew Cook	017227-0197	6606
7590	08/23/2005		EXAMINER	
Stephen A. Bent Foley & Lardner, Washington Harbour Suite 500 3000 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20007-5143			COOK, LISA V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/773,398	COOK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lisa V. Cook	1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/9/04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____



DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed 12/10/04 is acknowledged (Paper Filed 6/10/2005). In the amendment filed therein the specification and claim 1 were modified. Claim 2 was canceled and new claim 3 was added. Currently claims 1 and 3 are pending and under consideration.
2. Objections and/or rejections of record not reiterated below have been withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Please see the cited references throughout the disclosure and pages 19-21.
4. The information disclosure statement filed 9 February 2004 has been considered as to the merits prior to a First Action.

Applicant contends that the IDS filed on 2/9/04 lists all of the references cited in the application, according the objection is withdrawn.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Boissier et al. (Revue du Rhumatisme et des Maladies Osteo-Articulaires, 1991, Vol.58, No.1, 19-24)- Abstract Only in view of Foster et al. (U.S. Patent#4,444,879).

Boissier et al. teach the detection of type II anticollagen (CII) fragments. The fragments discussed include CB 8, CB 9.7, CB10, and CB11.

These peptide fragments (preparations including CB10) were recognized by antibodies targeted against endogenous human CII (antibody from the sample) and the complex was detected in patients having rheumatoid arthritis. See abstract.

Although Boissier et al. teach the reagents required by the claims; they do not specifically teach the reagents in kit configurations. In other words, the reference fails to teach the reagents as a kit. However, kits are well known embodiments for assay reagents. Foster et al. (U.S. Patent #4,444,879) describe one example. In their patent kits including the reactant reagents, a microplate, positive controls, negative controls, standards, and instructions are taught. The reagents are compartmentalized or packaged separately for utility. See figure 6, and column 15, lines 10-34.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to take the detection assay reagents as taught by Boissier et al. and format them into a kit because Foster et al. teach that it is convenient to do so and one can enhance sensitivity of a method by providing reagents as a kit. Further, the reagents in a kit are available in pre-measured amounts, which eliminates the variability that can occur when performing the assay. Kits are also economically beneficial in reagent distribution.

With respect to the kit containing written instructions (claim 3), it is noted that although the reference does not specifically disclose that a kit would have instructions which teach how to use said kit, it would have been prima facie obvious to any one of ordinary skill in the art to include instructions which describe how to perform the assay. Applicants should note that the printed matter on the instructions in a kit cannot serve to define the kit over the prior art. See *in re Gulack* 217 USPQ (CAFC 1983).

II. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Cremer et al. (The Journal of Immunology, 1992, Vol.149, No.3, 1045-1053) in view of Foster et al. (U.S. Patent#4,444,879).

Cremer et al. disclose the detection of antibody binding epitopes on type II collagen in sera. A panel of CB peptides (including CB10) was reacted with the sample antibody to form a binding complex. The CB10 peptide bound specifically to heterologous collagens. See abstract. The bound complex was detected by ELISA. See page 1046, 2nd column – Antibody assays.

Although Cremer et al. teach the regents required by the claims, they do not specifically teach the reagents in kit configurations. In other words, the reference fails to teach the reagents as a kit. However, kits are well known embodiments for assay reagents. Foster et al. (U.S. Patent #4,444,879) describe one example. In their patent kits including the reactant reagents, a microplate, positive controls, negative controls, standards, and instructions are taught. The reagents are compartmentalized or packaged separately for utility. See figure 6, and column 15, lines 10-34.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to take the detection assay reagents as taught by Cremer et al. and format them into a kit because Foster et al. teach that it is convenient to do so and one can enhance sensitivity of a method by providing reagents as a kit. Further, the reagents in a kit are available in pre-measured amounts, which eliminates the variability that can occur when performing the assay. Kits are also economically beneficial in reagent distribution.

With respect to the kit containing written instructions (claim 3), it is noted that although the reference does not specifically disclose that a kit would have instructions which teach how to use said kit, it would have been prima facie obvious to any one of ordinary skill in the art to include instructions which describe how to perform the assay. Applicants should note that the printed matter on the instructions in a kit cannot serve to define the kit over the prior art. See *in re Gulack* 217 USPQ (CAFC 1983).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants contend that there is no identified use for the kit components (namely as an indicator of rheumatoid arthritis) and hence no desire or need to put the reagents together in kit fashion, per the teachings of Foster. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because there is no requirement that the prior art must suggest that the claimed product will have the same or similar utility as that discovered by applicant in order to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 696, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1904 (Fed Cir 1990).

Both Boisser et al. (1991-Abstract) and Cremer et al. (1992-Abstract) teach the utility of the CB10 peptide to identify antibodies to CB10 in patient samples, thus one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to place the reagents in kit configuration to measure antibodies in a sample as set forth in the rejections above. An obviousness rejection is proper under Dillon so long as the prior art suggests a reason or provides motivation to make the claimed invention, even where the reason or motivation is different from that discovered by applicant.

Further, a "use" can only be properly claimed as a process or method. 35 USC 100(b), 101. See *Clnical Products v. Brenner*, 255 F.Supp.131, 149, USPQ 475, 477 (DDC 1966). In re Thuau, 1943 CD390.

In response to applicant's argument based upon the age of the references, contentions that the reference patents are old are not impressive absent a showing that the art tried and failed to solve the same problem notwithstanding its presumed knowledge of the references. See *In re Wright*, 569 F.2d 1124, 193 USPQ 332 (CCPA 1977).

Applicant argues that dependent claim 3 is separately patentable because it includes written instructions, however printed matter on the instructions in a kit cannot serve to define the kit over the prior art. See *in re Gulack* 217 USPQ (CAFC 1983).

7. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.

In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group TC 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1641

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lisa V. Cook
Remsen 3C-59
(571) 272-0816
8/17/05



LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

